

REMARKS

Drawings

In the subject office action, the drawings were objected to for various reference numbers not mentioned in the specification. In response, the specification has been amended accordingly to mention the reference numbers. Additionally, the specification was amended to correct a number of previously undetected informalities. None of the amendments are made to overcome the cited references.

Rejections of claims 1, 3-6, 9, 12-14, 20-32 and 39-49

In the subject office action, claims 1, 3-6, 9, 12-14, 20-32 and 39-49 were rejected under 102(e) in view of USP 6,266,690 issued to Shankarappa et al.

Claim 1

The Examiner asserted that Shankarappa, in column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28, disclosed all the required limitations of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 recites as follows:

A method comprising:

a computer, on behalf of a user, registering the user with a first web site;

the computer providing a first email address for use to register the user with said first web site;

the computer, on behalf of the user, registering the user with a second web site; and

the computer providing a second email address, separate and distinct from the first email address, for use to register said user with said second web site.

(Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, claim 1 requires that **the computer** registering the user with the first and second web sites, **provides the first and second email addresses for use** for the user registration. Moreover, the registering computer provided first and

second email addresses are ***separate and distinct from each other***. [Note that the limitations do not just say "the computer providing the user's email address to the web sites".]

In the referenced passage of col. 1, lines 16-18, Shankarappa disclosed that "Service providers routinely require subscriber to specify subscriber profile data such as a personal e-mail (electronic mail) address ..." In col. 1, lines 27-28), Shankarappa discloses a "list server" as an example of service that requires such provision, i.e. an email address of the registering subscriber.

While under Shankarappa, it would be inherent for the registering computer to provide (i.e. transmit) the email address to the service, but it is not inherent that the registering computer to provide the email addresses used in the registration, nor is it inherent the registering computer provides separate and distinct email addresses for the two registrations.

Shankarappa is silent on who provides the email address used in the registration. In view of the silence, one ordinarily skilled in the art would read the teaching to mean that the user provides the email address provided to the Service. As Applicant has discussed in the background section, typically, the email address provided by the user is a email address previously provided to the user by another party in another context. For example, the email address provided by the user may be his/her work email address, or a personal email address previously established with a personal email service, and so forth.,

In summary, since Shankarappa did not teach or suggest the required limitations of claim 1, i.e. ***to have the computer performing the registration for the user, also provides separate and distinct email addresses for use in the registrations***, Shankarappa does not anticipate the limitations of claim 1.

Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over Shankarappa.

Claim 21

The Examiner asserted that Shankarappa, in column 10, lines 12-17, and the earlier discussed column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28, disclosed all the required limitations of claim 21. Applicant respectfully disagree.

Claim 21 recites as follows

A method comprising:

an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider,
the e-device selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and
the e-device selecting a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP.

(Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, claim 21 requires the **e-device** to **obtain** a number of email addresses from **an email service provider** (an entity separate and distinct from the e-device), then select **a first** of the obtained email addresses to facilitate communication with a **first partner/group** (an entity separate and distinct from the e-device and the email service provider), and select **a second** of the obtained email addresses to facilitate communication with a **second partner/group** (an entity separate and distinct from the e-device, the email service provider, and the first communication partner). So, a total of **four** entities and requirements for their interrelationship are recited in claim 21.

In the referenced passage of column 10, lines 12-17, Shankarappa merely disclosed a streamlined method for the Service to facilitate customization by the subscriber. The streamlined method applies to the situation where the Service is also providing email service to the subscriber, "assigning the subscriber with an email address" hosted by the Service. Under this situation, the subscriber may use the same assigned email address (the subscriber's email address assigned by the Service) to submit a customization request to the Service, thereby relieving the

subscriber from having to remember its assigned email address as well as the Service's email address for submitting customization request.

Since in this discussion, the Service is the email service provider, therefore, the Service's computer clearly does not involve turning to a separate and distinct email service provider to obtain a number of email addresses, and then in turn use a first email address to facilitate communication with yet a first other entity, and a second email address to facilitate communication with a second other entity.

While in this discussion, the subscriber's computer obtained an assigned email address from Service, but there is no teaching that the subscriber's computer is to obtain ***multiple email addresses*** from the Service, and then use a ***selected first*** to facilitate communication with ***a first partner/group*** and use a ***selected second*** to facilitate communication with ***a second partner/group***.

The teachings of the reference passage of column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 have been earlier discussed, and do not remedy the deficiency in teachings of the reference passage of column 10, lines 12-17.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, claim 21 is patentable over Shankarappa.

Claim 24

The Examiner rejected claim 24 relying on the same passages on which the Examiner rejected claim 21. Applicant respectfully disagree.

Claim 24 recited as follows

A method comprising:

an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a first email address from an email service provider;

the e-device employing the first email address to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP);

the e-device obtaining a second email address, separate and distinct from said first email address, from the email service provider; and

the e-device employing the second email address to facilitate communication with a **second CP/GCP**.
(Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, claim 24 contains similar limitations as claim 21. So, for at least the same reasons, claim 24 is patentable over Shankarappa.

Claim 28

The Examiner rejected claim 28 relying on the same passages on which the Examiner rejected claims 21 and 24. Applicant respectfully disagree.

Claim 24 recited as follows

A method comprising:
a email service provider registering a user; and
the email service provider providing at least a **first and a second email address**, that are **separate and distinct**, to the user for use by the user to communicate with a **first and a second communication partner or group** of communication partners (CP/GCP).

(Emphasis added)

Accordingly, claim 28 also contains similar limitations as claim 21. So, for at least the same reasons, claim 28 is patentable over Shankarappa.

Claim 39

The Examiner rejected claim 39 relying on the same passages on which the Examiner rejected claim 21. Claim 39 is claim 21 in apparatus form. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 39 is patentable over Shankarappa.

Claim 41

The Examiner rejected claim 41 relying on the same passages on which the Examiner rejected claim 24. Claim 41 is claim 24 in apparatus form. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 41 is patentable over Shankarappa.

Claim 45

The Examiner rejected claim 45 relying on the same passages on which the Examiner rejected claim 28. Claim 45 is claim 28 in apparatus form. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 45 is patentable over Shankarappa.

Claims 3-6, 9 12-14, 20, 22-23, 25-27, 29-32, 40, 42-44, 46-49

These claims are dependent on claims 1, 21, 24, 28, 39, 41 and 45 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons claims 1, 21, 24, 28, 39, 41 and 45 are patentable over Shankarappa, these claims are patentable over Shankarappa.

Rejections of claims 2, 7, 8, 10 and 11

In the subject office action, claims 2, 7, 8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 103 in view of USP 6,266,690 issued to Shankarappa et al and Linden combined.

Claims 2, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are dependent on claim 1 incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, these claims are patentable over Shankarappa.

Linden does not remedy the above discussed Shankarappa's deficiency in teachings. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, these claims are patentable over Shankarappa, even when combined with Linden.

Rejections of claims 15-19, 33-38 and 50-55

In the subject office action, claims 15-19, 33-38 and 50-55 were rejected under 103 in view of USP 6,266,690 issued to Shankarappa et al and McCormick combined.

Claims 15-19

Claims 15-19 are dependent on claim 1 incorporating its limitations.

Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, these claims are patentable over Shankarappa.

McCormick does not remedy the above discussed Shankarappa's deficiency in teachings. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, these claims are patentable over Shankarappa, even when combined with McCormick.

Claim 33

Claim 33 recites as follows:

A method comprising:

a email service provider receiving emails addressed to **a first and a second email address of a user**, and
the email service provider organizing said received emails based at least in part on **said first and second email addresses**, and
intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses.

In rejecting claim 33, the Examiner reasoned that Shankaarappa teaches "email addresses", and McCormick teaches "organizing received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses of the user, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses". Applicant respectfully disagree.

Under the required organization limitations of first by "**said first and second email addresses of the user**" and "**intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses**", when an intended partner of the first email address sends a email to the second email address, it will be organized as unintended communication partner of the second email address (see Fig. 7 and its description). Similarly, if an intended partner of the second email address sends a email to the first email address, the email will be organized as unintended communication partner of first email address (see Fig. 7 and its description).

That's not the case under McCormick's teachings.

Under McCormick, a user may specify a sender's email address as a member of "no admittance list", a member of a "guest list". An incoming email from a sender whose email address is on the "no admittance list" will be rejected. An incoming email from a sender whose email address is on neither list will be placed in a "waiting list". An incoming email from a sender whose email address is on the "guest list" will be automatically admitted.

Accordingly, McCormick's organization approach is completely independent of the user's email addresses. In other words, McCormick does not anticipate organization based on ***the user's first and second email addresses*** at all.

Moreover, under McCormick's "guest list" approach, the intended communication partners of the first and the second email addresses will always be admitted, therefore, McCormick's "no admittance" and "guest" lists approach cannot be said as having anticipated organization based on "***intended and unintended communications partners' of the user's first and second email addresses***".

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, claim 33 is patentable over Shankarappa and McCormick combined.

Claim 35

Claim 35 contains similar limitations as claim 33. Therefore, for at least the same reason, claim 35 is patentable over Shankarappa and McCormick combined.

Claims 50 and 52

Claims 50 and 52 are claims 33 and 35 in apparatus form. Accordingly, for at least the same reason, claims 50 and 52 are patentable over Shankarappa and McCormick combined.

Claims 34, 36-38, 51 and 53-55

Claims 34, 36-38, 51 and 53-55 depend on claims 33, 35, 50 and 52 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, for at least the same

reason, claims 34, 36-38, 51 and 53-55 are patentable over Shankarappa and McCormick combined.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-55 are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, allowance of all claims, and early issuance of Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, PC

Date: March 12, 2003


Aloysius AuYeung
Reg. No. 35,432

Pacwest Center
1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste 1600-1900
Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: (503) 222-9981
FAX: (503) 796-2900